1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA	
2	**************************************	
3	IN RE: PROPULSID PRODUCT MDL 1355 LIABILITY LITIGATION Section "L"	
4	New Orleans, Louisiana Thursday, May 22, 2003	
5	9:00 a.m.	
6	TRANSCRIPT OF STATUS CONFERENCE HEARD BEFORE THE HONORABLE ELDON E. FALLON	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
8	A DDEADANCEC.	
9	APPEARANCES: LIAISON COUNSEL FOR	
10	PLAINTIFF: HERMAN, MATHIS, CASEY & KITCHENS BY: RUSS M. HERMAN, ESQUIRE LEONARD A. DAVIS, ESQUIRE	
11	820 O'Keefe Avenue	
12	New Orleans, LA 70113	
13	MURRAY LAW FIRM BY: JULIE JACOBS, ESQ.	
14	909 Poydras Street, Suite 2550	
15	New Orleans, LA 70112	
16		
17	ZIMMERMAN, REED, P.L.L.P. BY: CHARLES ZIMMERMAN, ESQ. 901 North Third Street, Suite 100	
18	Minneapolis, MN 55401	
19		
20	BARRIOS, KINGSDORF & CASTEIX	
21	BY: BRUCE KINGSDORF, ESQ. 701 Poydras Street, Suite 3650 New Orleans, LA 70119	
22	New Offeans, DA 70119	
23	DOMENCHARY MOTOUR & DOV	
24	DOMENGEAUX, WRIGHT & ROY BY: BOB WRIGHT, ESQ. 556 Jefferson Street, Suite 500	
25	Lafayette, LA 70502-3668	

the case and their indication was they did not desire to appeal. Of course the appeal period is still open, but in order for the PLC to act or not act, we're going to need something from them in writing indicating that.

THE COURT: If we need a 54(b), let me know and I'll do the 54(b). I don't think we need it, but if we do need it, we'll do that. Anything else on that?

MR. IRWIN: Judge, I guess this one is a little bit unusual, it's a single case and it's as described in paragraph 18. Apparently plaintiff counsel in this case filed a motion to withdraw in the transferee court. That motion was granted in the transferee court. The case was actually docketed here at the time. And in the meantime we went about the business of trying to get the patient profile form answered, and we were met with the information that he had withdrawn, was no longer counsel.

It is our view that he should be informed that he still is counsel and must necessarily file a motion here in the MDL, and then we will take up the question anew concerning the response to the PPF.

THE COURT: I agree with that. I think once the MDL court receives the transfer no further action is appropriate from the transferor courts. So I'll do a minute entry advising the party of that, and I'll send it directly to him, a copy to the Plaintiffs' Committee and a copy to you.

MR. HERMAN: Plaintiffs' position is that your Honor's ruling is clear that the Daubert motion was restricted to that case only. The defendants believe that it has universal application. And I don't think the matter, I don't know, we put it on here because it's of concern to both sides and there is a disagreement, but I don't know that it calls for the court to do anything at this time.

MR. IRWIN: Your Honor, we agree with Mr. Herman's observation on that point. We put it on the agenda to bring the issue to the court's attention. We are talking about it. I don't believe any side is in any position to make any recommendation to the court at this point, but it is something that we need to keep on our radar screen and we are going to continue discussions with the Plaintiffs' Steering Committee on that.

THE COURT: Okay. Next item is Motion to Withdraw in the Matter of Donald Anderson.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, with regard to Daubert, we are, the PLC will be requesting from plaintiff lawyers who actively involved in representing the clients that have gone to judgment advising us as to whether they desire to appeal the Daubert ruling itself, and as soon as we're advised and wired in we'll advise the court and opposing counsel.

I want to state to the court and opposing counsel at this juncture, we brought this issue to the attorneys trying

Withdraw.

MR. HERMAN: This frankly, your Honor, is the most troubling issue to counsel for plaintiffs on today's agenda. In addition to the cases listed, I understand there are approximately 300 claimants either represented directly by Bart and Gallagher or other counsel where the counsel wish to withdraw. Beyond individual counsels, obligations, the PLC has obligations to the same folks. We're attempting to work this issue out and we're going to need some time.

It may be that the PLC will agree to undertake the handling of those matters until whatever conclusion is reached. And we may not. But I would ask at this time that there be no, that the court consider not granting the motion to withdraw --

THE COURT: You need to tell the lawyers that I am not going to grant a motion to withdraw unless somebody substitutes for them. I am not going to cut 200 people loose without lawyers. I'm not going to do that. So they're going to be representing these people either voluntarily or involuntarily until somebody else comes in and substitutes for them. They have to know that.

MR. HERMAN: We'll advise them of that. We're attempting to work this out, and we'll report to your Honor either before or at the next status conference.

THE COURT: Application of the Daubert Motion to other Plaintiffs.

October, November, December, those months should be available.

I'll try to keep my calendar reasonably clear and see if we can handle it in that way.

MR. HERMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. HERMAN: There is really nothing to report on the pharmacy indemnity agreements, on the VeriLaw.

A planning committee has met a couple of times, they're still meeting, and we won't have anything to report, that is the defendants or the plaintiffs jointly, until the next status conference unless there is something that comes up that we need your Honor's input on.

THE COURT: In our last monthly meeting I made reference to the End Game Planning Committee, we set a meeting for that committee. I met with that committee, I felt the committee was moving in the appropriate direction. They have a spokesman for each side, experienced, talented individuals who are trying to focus on the end aspect of this litigation. Hopefully they'll make some headway.

And I met with them again this morning, and they have some future meetings set. I'll hear from them whenever it's appropriate.

Item 15 is Patricia Robinson's deposition.

MR. HERMAN: No issue regarding that.

THE COURT: Item 16 is Bart/Gallagher Motions to

pick them, those are the ones that I will deal with. If you don't pick any of them or fail to pick the cases, then I'll pick them and set them for trail. But you folks, because of your experience and professionalism and the way that you've been working in the case, you've been able to get a lot done by agreement. And so I'd like to give you an opportunity to continue to do this, look at the cases, decide which ones are ready for trial and pick those.

I'll require that this be done within two weeks.

The defendants have the responsibility of advising the court on the list of cases to be tried and the lawyers in those cases.

When I get that information, I'll then set a status conference on all of those cases with those lawyers and we'll talk about cutoff dates, reasonable cutoff dates, reasonable trial dates and see whether or not we can move them forward in that way.

Presently I'll probably try the cases myself. But if that doesn't work out, then I'll enlist the support of some of the other judges in the district. But presently I'll plan to do it myself, and we'll get some dates and cutoff dates in that fashion.

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, I have no desire on behalf of the PLC to delay that process, but I would ask that we have it until June 13th to do that.

THE COURT: Let's do that by June 13th. The dates that I would like to be focused on for trial dates is sometime in

1

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

15

14

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

additional motion to withdraw additional funds for the trust account in order to deal with hard costs and cost contributions to the common fund.

THE COURT: Declassified Documents is No. 9.

MR. HERMAN: We have nothing new on that, your Honor.

Item 10, Mediation, let me hear from the THE COURT: defendants.

MR. HERMAN: I'll let Jim or Tom report on that.

MR. IRWIN: Your Honor, the numbers are described in the joint report. Mr. Preuss is here today, and before we all jump on airplanes we're going to be talking to Mr. Davis about trying to pick some dates in June to resume the mediations, obviously we will have to work with Mr. Juneau on that, but that's the plan.

Okav. Fine. Trial Schedule is No. 9. THE COURT: There are no cases presently set for trial on those cases that have been filed in the Eastern District. I talked to counsel this morning in our premeeting conference, and my feeling is that the way we ought to handle trial scheduling is for the parties, the plaintiffs and the defendants to get together, look over those cases that are filed in Louisiana, see whether or not there is some realistic grouping that can be made of those cases and then decide which of those cases ought to be tried.

I'd like you to try to pick them first.

MR. HERMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

With regard to other discovery issues at page 4, sales force documents, their discussions between the parties as to the production of electronic materials, the defendants have indicated that they furnished hard copy of documents, and I believe of a non-electronic nature, so those discussions we're attempting to work that out.

With regard to Norcisapride, this has been a motion, there have been continuing discussions. We have agreed to some discovery on that issue, and pending completion of that discovery will advise the court as to whether the motion needs to be brought at all for here.

THE COURT: What is the reasonable time we can finish that?

MR. HERMAN: I think we ought to be able to finish it in the next four weeks.

THE COURT: Let's do it in a month then.

MR. HERMAN: And the defendants have indicated that within, I believe they said a week but I think they probably need ten days, to respond to with additional responses to set No. 7 of the Merit Interrogatories.

THE COURT: Let's do it within ten days.

MR. IRWIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: Item 8 is Trust Account.

MR. HERMAN: Yes, your Honor, we're going to bring an

states, tell me whether I have the responsibility, the duty, whatever to determine class certification for another state before I send it back to that particular state for trial. Another if not, then the Louisiana classes.

And I make no decision on any of those issues, but those are issues that I think I need some input on.

MR. HERMAN: Yes, your Honor. On Request For Production. First with regard to our request for admissions under 803 of what the PLC indicates are business records and should form exceptions to the hearsay rule, we've got responses from the defendants and we're working out a mechanism to bring before the court expeditiously and in a way that can be facilitated, the objections and the arguments on both sides.

THE COURT: The procedure that would be helpful is for you to give me the documents, even highlighting certain areas in the documents that a party feels is objectionable or that another party feels that is significant, and give me a list of the documents with the objections consisting of one line, one word, whatever, explaining the ground for your objection and the response that the plaintiffs make and then a little line for my ruling.

I'll try to look them over in globo, make some observations and discuss the law applicable to 803(6), and then I will go down the list and rule on each one of those objections, make it a part of the record and we'll move on.

5

to expedite this we'll just send them a copy of the transcript and they will be directly familiar with your Honor's intentions and rulings.

With regard to No. 6. We intend to call a PLC meeting on Monday, June 2nd in New Orleans. Those members that can't attend we'll ask to appear by conference call.

At that time we're going to discuss two issues regarding class certification, potential scheduling dates so that I can get together with Mr. Irwin and we can work back from that date.

Secondly, to narrow potential issues involved in class cert. And we'll also handle other business at that time, including a survey of cases that may be put on the trial calendar. Louisiana cases that may be put on the trial calendar.

THE COURT: Let me talk just briefly on class certification. As I see it, it would be helpful if the parties would discuss, first, the eligible issues for class certification. There are some that are more eligible than others. The other issues are (1) the potential of a national class; (2) individual state classes, whether it's this court's responsibility to determine whether there is a class for various states; and (3) whether there is a class for Louisiana.

So I think it's national, I think it's several states, if I've got only 30 class actions filed from various

With regard to the Degge Group. We plan to send someone to Degge to review their documents and then determine which documents we want copied. We're attempting to resolve some procedural issues that Degge has placed on the table.

THE COURT: I thought I made myself clear with the attorneys when we dealt with this issue. My feeling is that the most expeditious way of resolving this matter, and Degge Group should know this, is for the Plaintiff Committee to send a representative to their offices, prior to this visit Degge should have them put in a room or a reasonable facility the documents that are at issue, let the representative for the plaintiffs look them over, Degge can have a representative present at the time.

The documents that the plaintiffs are interested in should be tagged, affording Degge an opportunity to look over those tagged items. If Degge finds any of those tagged items objectionable, then they should make a log of those items, give it to me with the items, I'll look them over. Otherwise, the items that the plaintiffs express interest in will be copied at the plaintiffs' expense and delivered to the plaintiff. That's the easiest way of doing it.

Degge should be advised of that and reminded of that. I thought I made it clear. If not, get to me and I'll convene another conference.

MR. HERMAN: Thank you, your Honor. I think in order

Ms. Lambert's copy and I'll give Mr. Kingsdorf a copy for the State Committee and I have Mr. Davis' copy.

THE COURT: Thank you. Third Party Subpoena Duces Tecum is the fifth item.

MR. HERMAN: With regard, your Honor, to the subpoena issue to Dr. Zipes, there is still one issue outstanding, but we believe it's going to be resolved. The Ingenix --

THE COURT: First of all with Dr. Zipes, what's the realistic period at which that can be resolved?

MR. IRWIN: Your Honor, I think it's a communication question. There is a question about whether the documents that were furnished in connection with the certification, which has been supplied, included the corporate documents. I believe that they did, and I just need to confirm that to Mr. Davis that it included all of his corporate documents. And I think there are documents in that production that consist of his PC or PLC or something like that.

THE COURT: What's reasonable, a week?

MR. IRWIN: Yes.

THE COURT: Let's do it within a week. Thank you.

MR. HERMAN: With regard to Ingenix, your Honor, there is no problem with that.

With regard to McKinsey & Company, there is no problem with regard to that.

There is no problem with regard to Medicom.

THE COURT: The second item on the agenda is State

Liaison Counsel. I notice that we do have a representative

from the State Liaison Committee present. Do you have anything
to report?

MR. KINGSDORF: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: And could you give us your name, please.

MR. KINGSDORF: Bruce Kingsdorf and I'm appearing this morning on behalf of Ms. Barrios, Mr. Arsenault and Mr. Capretz and the State Liaison Committee.

MR. IRWIN: Your Honor, on item 3 of the court's agenda this morning, the joint report is the subject of the patient profile forms. There are 133 that are overdue and 17 coming due shortly. We have prepared and I think are planing on filling tomorrow the third motion that would address those 133 that are outstanding.

THE COURT: All right. For the record, the plaintiffs object to their dismissal without prejudice, I will dismiss them with prejudice. My feeling is that we've made every effort to call to the attention of those individuals that they have to take some action and take some action. Notwithstanding those efforts, they have failed to do so. So it's appropriate that they be dismissed from the lawsuit, file the motion and I'll take that action.

MR. IRWIN: We will do, your Honor.

Next on the agenda is the Service List and I have

PROCEEDINGS

(STATUS CONFERENCE)

(THURSDAY, MAY 22, 2003)

THE COURT: Be seated please. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Call the case, please.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: MDL No. 00-1355, in re, Propulsid Products Liability Litigation.

THE COURT: Counsel make your appearances, please.

MR. IRWIN: Good morning, your Honor, Jim Irwin for defendants.

MR. HERMAN: Good morning, Judge Fallon, Russ Herman for Herman Mathis and Herman, Herman Katz and Cotlar for the Plaintiffs Legal Committee.

THE COURT: We're here today for our monthly status report. I've received from the parties a proposed agenda of matters to be covered, I'll take them in the order given to me.

The first one is Update of Rolling Document Production and Electronic Document Production.

MR. HERMAN: We've had discussions with the defendants and production is ongoing. We do have some issues between the parties, but most of them are being resolved as we discussed. I have nothing further to report on that issue.

THE COURT: Anything from the defendant on item No. 1?

MR. IRWIN: No comment, your Honor.

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:	
2		
3		LEVIN, FISHBEIN, SEDRAM & BERMAN BY: ARNOLD LEVIN, ESQ. 510 Walnut Street, Suite 500
4		Philadelphia, PA 19301
5		
6		LEVIN, PAPANTONIO
7		BY: ROBERT BLANCHARD, ESQ. 316 S. Baylen Street, Suite 600
8		Pensacola, Florida 32501
9	FOR DEFENDANTS:	IRWIN, FRITCHIE, URQUHART &
10	TON BELENDING.	MOORE, L.L.C. BY: JAMES B. IRWIN, ESQUIRE
11		MONIQUE GARSAUD, ESQUIRE 400 Poydras Street, Suite 2700
12		New Orleans, LA 70130
13		
14		DRINKER, BIDDLE & SHANLEY
15		BY: THOMAS F. CAMPION, ESQ. 500 Campus Drive
16		Florham Park, NJ 07932-1047
17		
18		PREUSS, SHANAGHER, ZVOLEFF & ZIMMER BY: CHARLES F. PREUSS, ESQ.
19		225 Bush Street, 15th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104-4207
20		
21		
22	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER:	Karen A. Ibos, CCR, RPR
23		501 Magazine Street, Room 406 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130
24		(504) 589-7776
25	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer.	

MR. HERMAN: Your Honor, I would like the opportunity, 2 if your Honor does not object, to address the court in a matter 3 of personal privilege off the record. 4 5 THE COURT: Sure. Let me set another date for the 6 agenda first. How about Thursday, June 26th, is that an 7 agreeable date for the parties for the next meeting? At nine o'clock and I'll see the parties at 8:30. 8 9 Anything further, anybody? All right. Folks, 10 thank you very much. The court will stand in recess. 11 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Everyone rise. 12 (WHEREUPON, THE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED.) 13 14 15 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 16 I, Karen A. Ibos, CCR, Official Court Reporter, United 17 18 States District Court, Eastern District of Louisiana, do hereby 19 certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to 20 the best of my ability and understanding, from the record of 21 the proceedings in the above-entitled and numbered matter. 22 23 24 Karen A. Ibos, CCR, RPR 25 Official Court Reporter

MR. IRWIN: That should get things going, Judge.

1